DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 233 SP 025 058

AUTHOR Monahan, William G.; And Others
TITLE Extended Programs: Reactions from Member Institutions and from Established Programs. Final Report of the AACTE Task Force on Extended Programs.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Curriculum Development; Degrees (Academic); Higher Education; Internship Programs; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Development; *Program Length; Schools of Education; Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Educators; *Time Factors (Learning)
IDENTIFIERS American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ; *Extended Degree Programs

ABSTRACT

Results of an open-ended, five-question inquiry sent to sample members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) are presented and discussed. The questionnaire sought to probe into how AACTE members feel about the concept of an extended or five-year program for preparing prospective teachers. Questions concerned: (1) faculty discussion of and openness to extended programs; (2) reaction from the "field" to extended programs; (3) major problems foreseen; (4) respondent's individual point of view about extended programs; and (5) AACTE's position on extended programs. Results of the limited survey suggested that there are significant concerns and mixed views about the advisability of any aggressive advocacy on the part of AACTE in behalf of extended programs. A summary is presented of responses to the survey questions, and some interpretive comments are offered. Views from deans and/or directors of already established extended programs are also presented, with reference to questions and concerns that were raised by survey respondents. An analysis findings of the study is accompanied by a recommendation to AACTE on future efforts. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247233

EXTENDED PROGRAMS: REACTIONS FROM MEMBER INSTITUTIONS AND FROM ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS

FINAL REPORT OF THE AACTE TASK FORCE ON EXTENDED PROGRAMS

William G. Monahan,
Chairman
West Virginia University

ON BEHALF OF THE 1983 TASK FORCE:

Dr. Thomas E. Baker
Austin College
Sherman, Texas

Dr. Howard K. MaCauley
Bloomsburg State ~~College~~ University
Bloomsburg, PA

Dr. Gerald Pine
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

Dr. Richard Sagness
Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Pomeroy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP025058

NOTE OF APPRECIATION

With the submission of this final paper, concerned with the further development of the "idea of the extended program", the work of this AACTE Task Force is, at least, temporarily at a convenient point of closure.

This has constituted a significant AACTE activity and there has been an impressive set of contributions to the overall effort that needs to be somewhat formally acknowledged. The work of the current Task Force has been particularly selfless and although wearying, unquestionably notable. To Dr. Thomas Baker at Austin College in Sherman, Texas who took time from his precious and hard-earned Sabbatical Leave to help us with this final effort, I am most deeply indepted; to Dr. Howard McCauley at Bloomsburg State University in Pennsylvania, who provided neatly summarized and detailed, yet appreciably coherent notes, and without whose contributions we could not have proceeded; to Dr. Gerald Pine at Oakland University in Michigan, for his remarkable ability to distill mountains of data into meaningful content analyzed information, and to Dr. Richard Sagness at Idaho State University for his thoughtful insights and contributions throughout this sometimes discontinuous effort. These are truly the measure of the quality of leadership we enjoy in AACTE.

But there are others who have been involved with this work over the last few years to whom AACTE and this Task Force owes so much; to Dale Scannell at the University of Kansas and to Dave Smith at the University of Florida, both of whom not only worked on the formulation of the idea but subsequently implemented it; to Dr. Noreen Daley at Madonna College in Michigan who has supported our work in the face of obvious risks (as to some extent all do), and to Dr. Don Robinson at Oklahoma State University and Dr. Earl Harmer at the University of Utah, who have worked on such ideas for a number of years, we are also most grateful. Finally, to Dr. Robert Saunders at Memphis State who helped to write our major document and who has been an active supporter and advocate for these notions, we express our gratitude and respect.

There have been countless people in AACTE member institutions who have helped us with questions and answers and who have provided thoughtful criticisms of our efforts and constructive assistnace in the promulgation of the Extended Program concept: to all of these and to still more, the work of this Task Force is deeply indepted.

Last but not at all least in any sense has been the superb work of the AACTE staff who have made all of these efforts possible.

William G. Monahan, Chairman
West Virginia University
December, 1983

INTRODUCTION

The Task Force on Extended Programs is currently in its third year and, with the presentation of this paper, will have generally completed its assigned obligations. Over that period of time several important developments and activities have been pursued; the major culmination of the work was the publication by AACTE of the excellent booklet, Educating A Profession: Extended Programs for Teacher Education (dated September, 1983).

In its early phase, work of the Task Force resulted in the approval of a resolution of the Association in support of a longer and more coherent pre-service training pattern together with the implication that curricula would be significantly reformed. Chief among the presumptions of all such models of longer-than-four-year programs (which account for the terminology, "Extended Programs") was that of a longer and more intensively monitored 'internship' or student-teaching practicum. The most significant work of the Task Force was the production of a major association paper which was revised in the second year of the Task Force and currently constitutes the seminal statement of the AACTE with reference to this concept. (See above) . This booklet includes a variety of 'models' of such programs, some of which call for a terminal MA degree, others for a five-year baccalaureate, and some for more extensive or six-year programs leading to a Teaching Doctorate or the equivalent. Within these major patterns are several variations. Each of these is treated in the AACTE publication.

In this year's work of the Task Force, it was recognized that the general circumstances of contemporary events have unquestionably dampened some of the earlier enthusiasm for the idea of extended programs. These events certainly have included the deepening economic depression nationally, which captured our attention singularly during 1981-82, and which came so soon at the edge

of the earliest work of the Task Force. Coupled with a growing national perception of deterioration in the condition of the teaching profession itself, as reflected in the spate of reports and studies of the last two years, these realities have contributed to a suspicion on the part of the Task Force and the board that the "extended program" excitement has somewhat abated.

While much more than that probably needs to be said about the relationship of the idea of extended programs to the contemporary environment of attitudes about the necessity for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education, suffice at this point to merely assert that the "context" now is certainly different than in 1980 when Extended Program concepts were gaining a high level of propensity for action.

ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES

In view of present circumstances, it was decided that the most useful function that the Task Force could perform as it began to move toward closure was to probe a little more confidently into exactly how the preparation arm really feels about the concept, on the one hand, and what the experiences of some of those already established "extended" programs have to tell us on the other. These two major thrusts have therefore constituted the work of the Task Force during 1983 and this report provides the substance of that effort.

RATIONALE AND PROCEDURES

It occurred to those of us currently serving in the Task Force that while we have talked a great deal about 'extended programs' and have entertained considerable opportunity for the membership to become involved in discussions and provide views and questions (e.g., sessions at each of the last three annual meetings), we are still somewhat ignorant of the general

views of our membership regarding these initiatives. Moreover, even though there has been considerable opportunity for institutional exposure to conceptual rationales as well as reports of established programs in the literature, our private conversations and informed opinions have suggested that, as is sometimes endemic of persons in leadership roles, we may be much "farther out in front" of our professional colleagues than we may have presumed. We very honestly just have not really known very much about the generalized attitude of institutions or institutional representatives regarding this rather dramatic recommendation for significant reform in teacher education; nor do we really know very much about the problems, prospects, and status of those several teacher education programs which have already initiated such efforts.

PROCEDURE

With reference to the first concern, we provided a quite simple five question, open-ended inquiry and asked AACTE staff to send it to a sample of all types of institutional members. In this part of our work, the interest was in attitudes and opinions about Extended Programs and the problems that our membership see as significant with regard to such a notion. Utilizing the computer generated sampling list, the questionnaire was sent to 103 member institutions; these were drawn from representatives of the major categorical constituent institutional members of the association: specifically: (1) Independent liberal arts institutions; (2) Land-grant colleges and universities; (3) Public, non-land-grant institutions; (4) Church-related liberal arts institutions; (5) Private universities; we also included a sixth special category (6) Predominantly black institutions. The following table summarizes the pattern of responses:

TABLE I

Responses from Various Types of Members

Type of Institution	Contacted	Responded
Independent Liberal Arts	8	6
Land-Grant Institutions	13	6
Public, non Land-Grant	38	12
Church-related Liberal Arts	28	8
Private Universities	9	2
Predominantly 'Black' Institutions	7	2
	103	36

This reflects an overall response of about 33 percent; while that hardly suggests a whirlwind of interest, it never-the-less provides at least about a "third" more of a cross-section of opinion and view than we have had previously. There is no claim made that this procedure reflects a tightly designed research effort; it was merely a pattern of inquiry and it seems to have served that purpose adequately.

SUMMARIZING THE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS

Without any attempt at categorizing the responses by type of institution at this point, the following summarizes the responses to the general questions -- we will treat some of the more interesting comments more specifically presently.

Question # 1: Has there been discussion in your faculty of the idea of Extended Programs and how would you characterize its flavor?

Summary: Not much discussion regardless of institutional type or size.

General attitude -- such as it is -- is mixed at best; there is more interest among public non-land-grant institutions, least among private universities, and the most expressed anxiety, generally from

the independent and church-related liberal arts institutions.

Question # 2: Has there been reaction from the "field" and, if so, how would it be characterized?

Summary: Although there was some expected confusion as to what the "field" means, there is apparently little expressed interest or concern either from the frame-of-reference of practice or from that of the "state association of CTE s" -- thus, the character of reaction from the field has been, first of all negligible and, secondly, of what there has been, generally uninformed.

Question # 3: If your institution were to consider such a program, what are some of the major problems foreseen?

Summary: Even a superficial content-analysis of this response would yield as many as twenty different problem statements. The general consensus has mostly to do with resources, timing, programmatic difficulties within the institution (both for teacher education faculty and institutional attitude), and problems of articulation. These data are usefully revealing and, as with all of the questions, this memorandum will deal with some of these issues in a little more detail presently. In general, the major concern was resources and costs -- problems of asking students and parents to take on added costs while the pay-offs seem problematical.

Question # 4: What is your own point of view about extended programs?

Summary: The general conclusion has to be that, of those who understand it (some 'chiefs' still seem to think that we are talking about some kind of an off-campus "extension" program!!), the general consensus is cautiously negative. This means that while they may feel that there is considerable merit in the idea, in an idiological sense, the whole general "context" at the present time is not propitious to our pursuit of it. Some -- chiefly among some public land-grant and Church-related liberal arts institutions --

believe it is a "bad" idea in any case. The group of institutions for which there is the most support is among the public non-land-grant institutions.

Question # 5: As part of similar thrusts, there are a number of initiatives now in effect or being considered -- e.g., Oklahoma's professional year, Tennessee's 'Master Teacher' plan, and real extended programs like those at Kansas University, and the proposed "pre-teach" at Florida -- What should AACTE's position be?

Summary: AACTE should support these efforts, watch them, gather data on their status and effectiveness, report their progress, problems, and successes to the profession. In large part, the view is cautious observation and qualified support, but with AACTE assuming a reporting and monitoring role regarding these various initiatives.

SOME INTERPRETIVE COMMENTS

This very limited survey suggests that there are significant concerns and mixed views about the advisability of any aggressive advocacy on the part of AACTE in behalf of extended programs and particularly within the frame-of-reference of those models that might call for significant restructuring of curricula and degree designations.

The data, though admittedly scanty and subjective, never-the-less provide us with a fairly useful intimation of how the membership feels about the idea. In essence, we repeat that the overall view is cautiously skeptical and is terribly cluttered with the expected suspicions of a profession caught-up in a period of anxiety over enrollments, purposes, and public pressures relating to its overall performance. There are the usual number of programs worrying about their own abilities to sustain what they are already trying to do without considering a "radically new" initiative and other programs of at least equal or greater number who continue to worry about whether any such new difinition of professional preparation will mean that

they will lose out to those who are more interested in maintaining the status quo.

It is never-the-less encouraging that there were more articulate reactions from those sampled who were favorable and supportive of the extended programs concept even though there were not many of them. Moreover, these types of responses also seemed to reflect more activity within faculties and more discussion of the concept from the field; this leads us to believe that there is some significant leadership being exerted in some areas in behalf of the idea and that is very notable since it suggests that among our rather diverse institutional framework, there is indeed thoughtful support for the kind of reform in Teacher Education Curricula that -- whether for Extended Programs or some other possible alternative -- never-the-less recognizes that important curricular change is now mandatory. The importance of this observation has much more to do with its implications for leadership itself than with any particular pattern of professional preparation. It means, as the Task Force perceives it, that there is a strong core of leadership within AACTE which, though typically a small coterie is never-the-less at the proverbial "cutting-edge" of change.

In addition, the number of persons in the sample who indicated straightforward and thoughtful opposition to the idea was very small. At first glance, that seems to be typical of any issue in which the strong advocates and the strong opponents have their views clearly in hand. What is perhaps somewhat disheartening is that there is such a large body of attitude that is either just fearfully anxious about it without much apparent thoughtful analysis one way or the other or is, on the other hand, just seemingly cynical about any such dramatic overture for significant change.

It is unfair to suggest that critics of this notion are wrong, or that those who are fearful are not bold enough, or that they are just looking for their own self-interests, for all of these motives have been implied by some

of those of us who think Extended Programs is the "way to go". Certainly some of those who have expressed opposition fit those descriptions and it does seem reasonably accurate for the AACTE Board to perceive the issue of the extended program concept in light of the presumption that leadership in academic teacher education is surely easiest when we merely "mind the store". On the other hand, it is altogether clear that arguments for any kind of dramatic change in preparation curricula and especially those that result in longer periods of study and supervised practice in the face of little empirical evidence that such changes truly make any real difference tend to reduce our arguments in behalf of "extended" programs to theoretical postulates. Thus, it seems to members of this Task Force that, at first glance, we face a familiar developmental problem: in the so-called "real" world, the experimenter cannot control the environmental factors which determine the effectiveness of his notions so how does one know with any degree of confidence that one process is better than some other? The thoughtful skeptic says to us: what is all that bad about what we are doing? If we had better people with whom to work, our present pattern would be o.k.. "Where", he asks, "is your proof that what you suggest, with all its additional risks, is better?"

There is thus, probably no more illustrative issue that reflects the difficulties of an organization like AACTE that brings together so many diverse and, sometimes, almost mutually exclusive enlightened self-interests than one such as this -- one that puts us in the uncomfortable position of advocating something that, to quote James Madison, "...might inflame us with animosity and render us to vex each other than to cooperate for the common good."

It is most difficult for AACTE to exercise a kind of leadership that may seem certainly to go "against the grain", yet, based on the second phase

of this Task Force's work during this past year, that may indeed be the posture that AACTE's Board may want to assume. Accordingly, we now turn to the information which we were provided by a selective set of institutions that have either already established extended programs or, in the case of the University of Florida, have the program approved and will formally admit the first class in 1984.

THE ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS

As a consequence of inviting views from the sample of institutions within AACTE regarding the "Extended Programs" concept, the Task Force also wanted to solicit views from deans and/or directors of already established programs with reference specifically to some of the major questions and concerns that were raised by respondents to the small survey.

The choice of programs that the Task Force decided to explore was dictated by the simplest of criteria -- they were the principal ones that were known about!

Accordingly, members of the Task Force interviewed administrators associated with four such established programs: Austin College in Sherman, Texas; the University of New Hampshire in Durham; the University of Kansas in Lawrence; and the newly established program at the University of Florida in Gainesville. Florida's program is called 'PROTEACH' and is of particular interest because it is the newest of these extended curricula and because it has emerged in the midst of a whole variety of state interests in educational reform that has characterized Florida as a leading state in preoccupation with educational issues.

The New Hampshire and Austin College programs, on the other hand, have been established over a number of years. The Austin College program was primarily developed through the joint efforts of Dr. William Freeman, who is the former Chairman of the Department of Education, and Dr. Virginia Love,

Professor of Education; it has been most ably continued and managed by Dr. Thomas Baker who has served as Director since 1975. It's first class was certified in 1972. The University of New Hampshire's program was initiated in 1974 and has been solicitously administered by Dr. Michael D. Andrew, Director of Teacher Education.[1] Thus, these are two programs with a considerable 'track-record' and provide reliable information regarding almost any question or concern that anyone might raise regarding extended programs.

Neither the Austin College nor New Hampshire programs are in institutions which one might characterize as being of great size although one is the public state university and the other is in a smaller, private liberal arts institution. Bot of these programs developed in a relative absence of notoriety or national media attention although both have enjoyed recognition within the academic teacher education community.

The program at the University of Kansas, on the other hand, was the first at a larger multi-function state comprehensive university and in a large school of Education, and the program at the University of Florida fits that same general academic description. All of these programs bear the imprint of thoughtful and persistent leadership and commitment; Drs. Freeman, Love, and Baker at Austin College and Mike Andrew at New Hampshire reflect the type of professional confidence in "new" notions that such changes require if they are going to "work". The Kansas program, for example, came about primarily as a consequence of the confidence and drive of Dean Dale Scannell, who has been active in leadership roles in American Teacher Education for a number of years. He has been influential in the association of deans of schools and colleges of education in land-grant and state universities and was the senior author of that association's important statement on quality

---

[1] See, e.g., Michael D. Andrew, "Characteristics of Students in a Five Year Teacher Education Program", Journal of Teacher Education, Jan-Feb, Vol. 34: 1, 1983.

standards; he was also the principal author of the major AACTE Task Force Statement on alternative accreditation which has been adopted by NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education), and was the Chairperson of the Extended Program Task Force of AACTE in its initial year.

The Florida developments reflect another example of a committed and articulate collegiate dean in the person of Dr. David Smith. Smith did a remarkable job in coalescing a diverse but distinguished faculty in behalf of an innovative teacher education design. He, too, has been nationally active in teacher education developments having served and contributed to the earlier work of the extended programs Task Force and who will assume the national Presidency of the AACTE in February, 1984.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Even though all of these programs qualify as "extended" -- that is, each requires a longer-than-four-year commitment, they are never-the-less all somewhat different as well and therefore reflect to some extent, the different various designs for extended programs that are included in the AACTE booklet previously referred to. PROTEACH at Florida will result in the awarding of a Masters degree to successful graduates; the Austin College program also leads to the M.A. while both the Kansas and the New Hampshire programs are five year baccalaureates. In both latter cases, however, the overwhelming majority of students go on for the M.A. which in both institutions is apparently an easier transition than in more typically 'free-standing' separate program formats; i.e., it is a more natural movement process from B.A. to M.A.

In the following paragraphs, we will provide the major questions that were raised and follow that with a summary of the views expressed to us regarding them. These were "open-ended" questions, and we have not attempted to content-analyze the responses in any explicit codification pattern.

For purposes of this report, we have merely summarized the information. Though papaphrased, the questions are precisely those raised most frequently in responses to a question in the earlier survey asking about some of the major problems with extended programs were such respondents' institutions to consider initiating such a program.

Question 1: What about the issue raised by many of our respondents that Extended Programs must surely be much more expensive to operate?

As one would presume, discussion of this possible circumstance was variously qualified; i.e., there was a general kind of "Yes, but..." set of responses from all of the four existing programs. In summary however, it seems fair to conclude that any kind of extended program will indeed require some additional resources; never-the-less, some of the qualified notions are instructive.

All program officials agree that in most cases, teacher education programs have endured a history of under-funding anyway compared to almost any other professional curriculum. All also agree that any time one lengthens the period of study beyond the traditional four-year program, there will be added costs. Important factors are brought to bear, however, by the additional training and a couple of comments are useful as examples of this point of view:

> (University of New Hampshire:) "...our program (does) require added resources but two major factors compensate for this. (1) We believe we have a far superior program that attracts and produces better graduates; (2) the use of resources is far more efficient from a 'product-produced' standpoint. In our four-year program with a semester of student teaching at the end, no more than 60% of the graduates sought teaching jobs. (Less than 60% actually took such jobs.) Forty percent went on to something else. ...Now about 90% of graduates get teaching or related jobs the first year out. Thus, the extended program has a product efficiency advantage of about 30% over the traditional program. The added costs due to smaller classes and so forth, is about 15% in our situation, so the extended program is actually a much more efficient use of resources."

And from the Austin College program:

> "...(it is questionable) that the ATP (Austin Teacher Program) requires more resources than traditional programs simply because it is a five year program. The most precious commodity is faculty time. Ours is a kind of a labor-intensive program at a small college that makes a lot of demands on one's time in any case and... it certainly requires more or available funds for start-up costs and for 'seed-money.' The bottom-line is that it may cost more but is well worth it; we could never go back to the 4-year pattern even if financial exigencies forced us into a corner. (God-forbid!)"

At the University of Kansas, the following comment:

> "Costs are probably higher. (The) model requires relatively small sections of introductory courses and the program, in general, requires more individualized student attention. It appears the program will require more faculty and support personnel than a traditional program. (At this point) it is too early in the development to be specific about costs."

At Florida, data and experience have only to do with initiation since the program is only ready to enroll its first class; these comments in that regard may be helpful:

> "The point that needs to be made is that <u>any</u> kind of program improvement in academic teacher education is going to require increased resources. In PROTEACH there will be a deliberate emphasis on computers and other applicable technology, for just one example; but that certainly must be the case even with traditional programs and that will cost something. What needs to be admitted is that questions of increased costs must not be used as any kind of defensive rationalization for not engaging in on-going program development. So, yes, I have to say that if any important changes in improved programs, whether for extending the so called 'life-space' of teachers-in-training or otherwise are <u>not</u> going to cost us something more than what we're now spending, no programs are going to be any better."

Question 2: <u>What is your reaction to issues related to student recruitment into extended programs? That is, the problem with requiring more tuition and student commitment but in a situation in which the salary and working conditions seem to inhibit that? Will this have an additional negative impact on already declining enrollments?</u>

The general reaction of program officials related to this set of interrelated concerns is optimistic based on experiences in the case of the well established programs and on both assurances and anticipated expectations from the others. Thus, in all cases, enrollments in the extended programs have held to planned levels and school district personnel administrators

in the case of the two newer programs -- at Kansas and Florida -- have been enthusiastic and have indicated a preference for these graduates. Equally important, in the case of the two programs that will award the MA degree, there is the added expectation that such students will start-out at higher entry level salaries. All agree that enrollment declines, such as they are, have less to do with the extended programs than with the general demography in teacher education; yet in the case of New Hampshire, enrollment in the new program has increased. Some of the following comments regarding this question are indicative of program views:

At Kansas:

> "Since we have not yet graduated a class, we have no authentic experience with the employability issue; we have assurances from school districts in our service area that they will pay higher salaries for graduates of the program. Regarding enrollment, there has not been any significant decline and we do not believe students are being driven away by the extended program. However, we do not have definitive data on this yet; we are experiencing some losses in the traditional program."

At Austin College:

> "We have experienced enrollment declines over the past several years but since we offer only the one program, we have to presume that it is merely a function of the same circumstances that have caused enrollment declines in teacher education generally. As a matter of fact, our undergraduate lab sections now indicate that we are starting to gain again. So far as recruitment is concerned, we are hampered; but again, that is as much a function of our high tuition costs as to the program and is always going to be a problem for us, regardless of the type of program we operate. The college does enjoy an excellent reputation however and our students remain very top-notch."

The University of New Hampshire has the best longitudinal experience with this issue; these comments are optimistic in that regard:

> "Enrollments in the extended program are steady and quality is very high while enrollments in the four-year options (we still give students a choice) are dramatically down -- from 130 in 1977-78 to 38 in 1983-84 for example. The extended program obviously attracts students -- they want a strong subject matter major and a year-long internship and since most of these students complete the MA in the process, they can average from $800 to $1,500 at entry, which defrays the additional costs."

Question 3: In initiating such a program, was there considerable faculty resistance and anxiety, and how did you deal with that? Also, what was the nature of student reaction?

It would be naive to presume that any such significant change as those reflected in any of the several program models for extended programs would not elicit lively debate and both genuine and articulate reservations as well as opposition generated only by concerns for disrupting routines and complacency. Clearly therefore, it is axiomatic that the kind of leadership and planning that results in the decision to initiate important program changes is crucial to the success of such ventures. The responses from the four programs the Task Force explored reflect this necessity, but they also reflect the extent to which such planning and procedures are both very complex and time-consuming.

With reference to the whole important process of developing such significant curriculum and program reforms, it would probably be particularly useful to have detailed and extensive case studies, for it is not possible to recapture enough of the flavor of the whole context of events involved in brief summarizations as we here provide. The following excerpts from Task Force members' conversations with program officials therefore just barely touch this vital aspect of program development.

The real accomplishment in such planning seems finally to require enough time and opportunity for as much participation and discussion as is useful while simultaneously being able to continue to move effectively and with all deliberate speed toward the definitive nature of a proposal together with the explicit procedures necessary to its implementation. That seems to be the consensus of the programs now in place.

At Austin College:

> "There was resistance from some people in the institution and there was strong support as well. A most important factor was active support from the college president. Some of the people who couldn't

adjust to the new program, left. The program was in place before I came and much of my comment in this regard is therefore somewhat academic. But it required courage and imagination and our people flew all over the country looking at various programs; there was a conference held up in Estes Park, Colorado that public school people and faculty attended together to kind of hammer-it-out; but none of it would have been remotely possible without the active and informed support and encouragement of the institution's then president."

At University of New Hampshire:

"The fifth-year program here was planned by a consortium of Education faculty, school teachers and administrators, state Department personnel, and able students. In final analysis, resistant faculty were just outvoted. Most of the resistance has been from subject-matter departments that enjoyed lots of teacher education students who had little 'say' in the program. Perhaps that may have been a mistake (since) most of these have remained resistant and discourage students from electing the five-year option. School administrators were among the most enthusiastic supporters now and during the planning phase."

At University of Kansas:

"In developing the model, there was a serious attempt to have significant involvement of all constituencies from the beginning. The process involved at least the following: (1) a faculty retreat as a consequence of which the initial 'go' decision was made; (2) broadly-based faculty committees were formed to develop a strong concept paper; (3) several different committees, which included faculty and public school personnel, were assigned to design parts of the concept paper and react to other parts; (4) faculty votes were taken on each major stage of the development. It is easier to obtain agreement on principles but there has been some anxiety and some resistance as changes have been implemented. That is now beginning to decrease and students seem very satisfied with it though we have not yet accumulated much solid data on that."

At University of Florida:

"The one thing that you have to be prepared to face is that this kind of program development takes an inordinate amount of your time as an administrator and of everybody else's time too -- much more than one anticipates even when one never-the-less knows that it will take a lot! Getting a lot of people who are pretty important in their own ways of being and who take justifiable pride in the fact that they know they have already been doing a good job and to get them to work in a committed fashion on something that could be perceived as implying they haven't done all that well ... that takes much patience and much talk. Still, there wasn't as much resistance as one might imagine although anxiety seemed to surface at various times and sometimes it was greater than at others of course; for example, whenever we voted on something like sending the plan to the curriculum committee or something like that -- the crucial decision

points. But actually, we now have a lot more commitment to the plan than anyone might think we'd have the right to expect and even some of those who had the most reservations are increasingly taking on their fair share of the load and helping us to get it right. It's a real measure of the integrity of many -- most of our faculty. We passed it by about 72% and I think in the kind of organizations we work in, that's about as much support as anyone ever gets."

Question 8: Are there problems with school districts -- student teacher placements, for example? And does the longer internship create difficult interorganizational issues?

In response to this question, all programs indicated little difficulty. On the contrary, in most cases not only were administrators in school districts importantly involved in the planning and development phases but were among the most positive supporters of the changes. In the case of one of the programs, the implementation has been virtually in a single school district and the district provides services and activities well beyond those primarily related to student teaching. The district is providing a comprehensive instructional laboratory environment and those public school teachers directly involved with it are appointed as adjunct instructors within the School of Education faculty. Obviously any such more extensive and intensive program has the potential of generating problems and the relationship with school districts requires attention but the general experience clearly supports the conclusion that it is not that more administratively nor operationally difficult than the older 4-year conventional relationships with onsite, hands-on, student teaching activities.

Question 9: Are there problems of any significant nature with other nearby teacher education programs?

In regard to this concern which was raised as a potential problem of some concern by a number of respondents to the earlier survey, the responses from the four programs explored was that they had not perceived anything that anyone might characterize as "significant." All have encountered a variety

of perceptions from such other programs but that such perceptions seem to reflect as much support as criticism. There continues to be much curiosity regarding the newer programs and there is a wait-and-watch kind of attitude which our respondents considered altogether normal. All of these programs have developed avenues for dealing reasonably with students interested in transferring into the extended programs but none has experienced any determinate antagonisms nor do any of them have any evidence to suggest that nearby programs feel either threatened or influenced.

Question 10: Are there any pressures for returning to the older pattern -- for discontinuing the extended program?

In the case of the University of Florida, this question is of course not relevant -- the program is just beginning. It would be a denial of the reality of the academic culture to suggest that every member of a collegiate faculty is ready to lead cheers for any curriculum change. Probably as well, it would not be a healthy sign were such unanimous support to exist. As was said to us therefore, "...certainly there are some in our faculty who would like to go back, but most would not." Interestingly as well, the recent spate of national reports, and especially in the case of A Nation at Risk, support has increased in all of the programs we explored. In a couple of cases, much more interest and support has been forthcoming from central executive officers.

At New Hampshire, where they still provide a four-year conventional option with a residue of support for that from academic departments, there was apparently argument for allowing math teachers to opt only for the four year program as consequence of the shortage of qualified math teachers. Apparently as well, this hasn't resulted in any additional people electing math education, and in the case of those that have taken that route, some evidence that quality remains lower than for the extended program.

The conviction at Austin College is emphatic: "We would never go back."

Question 11: In your informed view, is there general satisfaction with the program at this point?

After analyzing the various responses (some of this data goes on to fifteen or so single-spaced typewritten pages), this question seems in retrospect to be somewhat rhetorical. The answer is clear: there may be some frustration and even some dissatisfaction with the newer programs in terms of "where they are", but there is much satisfaction with "where they are going!" All of the programs -- new, and longer-established, will continue to need what we might felicitously refer to as 'fine-tuning', but there is universal agreement that the programs are better, attract not only better prepared students, but students that are 'better' in other ways -- in commitment and seriousness about their careers, more questioning and less docile, who are and will be better teachers.

* * * * * * *

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With the submission of this paper, it is presumed that the work of the Task Force on Extended Programs has completed its charge from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. In summary, in this final paper we have carried out two activities: (1) to explore the general attitudes and perceptions of a sample of AACTE member institutions with reference to the idea of extending the period of professional preparation for entry into teaching and thereby, to significantly reconceptualize and refashion the context of that preparation; and (2) to explore some of the problems that were raised by that inquiry with established principals in four established programs.

Accordingly, the 1983 Task Force on Extended Programs sees this final paper as reflecting a very important additional footnote to the already

published AACTE document, Educating A Profession: Extended Programs in Teacher Education. At the same time, this prolonged effort has also generated other interests; not least among these was the private memorandum to the AACTE Board from the Task Force Chairman expressing concern about the overall calibre of leadership in teacher education programs under the title: "A Note to the Board: The Crisis in Leadership in American Teacher Education," (September, 1983) which, together with other activities of this Task Force merely suggests that concerns for imaginative re-thinking of the curriculum and process of teachers-in-training is an issue with which all members of this association must increasingly give more serious and active attention.

It is moot as to whether the idea of the Extended Program (and the major commitment to that set of ideas that AACTE has made over the past few years) is served well or badly by the circumstances of the emergence of 1983 as the "year of the report" -- in other words, whether the fact that the status of American capital 'E' Education has become a national preoccupation will add impetus to the extended program notion or will possibly eliminate that idea from further consideration in educational reform. If the latter turns out to be the case, the modest inquiry reported in this paper clearly suggests great disappointment, for such programs clearly demonstrate that they can accomplish much of what critics say we must do better in teacher education.

It does not seem to be a startling observation that there is a growing skepticism regarding whether professional teacher education adds anything much at all to the preparation of anyone who wants to teach school in America today. Curiously, some of that skepticism is being voiced within some sectors of traditional Education units in colleges and universities themselves; there is unmistakable evidence that there are some schools and colleges of education whose interests are so intimately associated with research identities increasingly removed from the improvement of educational practice that they unwit-

tingly seem to contribute to the naive belief that anyone with a subject-matter major can teach. All of this only means beyond question that the substance of teacher education -- the 'knowledge base', the existence and value of which we have so clearly established in recent years -- shall come increasingly into epistemological question.

We shall therefore most certainly confront a growing sentiment that holds that if what we do is so largely inconsequential, how is it rational for us to think seriously about doing still more of it! Such notions obviously have little informed basis in the facts of effective preparation. even when it is done conventionally, and yet, the evidence is mounting that marginal and weak programs might surely be the measure of all programs.

We believe that there are certainly immense battles that American teacher education will have to wage in the next ten years and not least among them is overcoming a monstrous credibility gap and dealing with our own defensive commitments in the bargain. There is acute need for us to argue more eloquently and aggressively for increasing the academy's control of teacher education curricula which have become more the property of state education agencies and legislatures than of colleges and universities; for more adequate resource bases, and for greater coherence within all sectors of our large and diverse profession. But with all of that, we must also demonstrate that the academy remains the best place for professional teacher preparation programs to be designed and implemented.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation of the Task Force on Extended Programs is that the AACTE Board continue to vigorously advocate the establishment of extended programs in teacher education; that it maintain continuous information on the progress and prospects of all such established programs and provide what-

ever appropriate assistance and consultation that is within its authority to such programs as well as to any institution interested in developing any of the acknowledged 'models.' Finally, that AACTE issue a special commendation to the four programs that participated in this study as recognition of imaginative and courageous efforts to make a real difference in teacher preparation.